7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
12/26/91

Dear Mr. Costner,

This letter is prompted by the concerns today's Washington Post (attached) says you expressed to the Nashville Tennessean. Anticipating that you and others in the JFK cast would have or would develop concerns I sought quite some time ago to obtain your and a few other addresses, without success.

Over the holiday period I expect a visit from a young friend just starting in your business. If he is able to deliver this in person to you I'll ask him to ask you if he may remain until you finish reading it so that you may question him about me if you'd like to. He is a JFK-assassination subject expert as a consequence of the work he did for his master's thesis. We met when I helped him with it. It won him CINE's Golden Eagle in the history division.

Your words that I quote reflect that you were deceived and misled in several ways: "All those documents which the government sealed until 2029 should be opened now so that we can know what happened."

Until rather late, when the movie was about completed, Oliver Stone used a different formulation. He promoted himself and his movie by representing that all government JFK assassination records were suppressed. He then used the years 2039 and said that the CIA could suppreess its records almost into perpetuity.

I believe he changed his formulation after he learned the truth from one of two of my friends who have campaigned for the disclosure of the records of the House Select Committee on Assassinations and that while not retracting his earlier false representations emphasized these. I'll return to this.

I wrote Stone first February 8, when I read that he announced that his movie would be based on Garrison's "On the Trail of the Assassins." From personal experience I knew that was the one trail Garrison never took. I spent much time in New Orleans seeking to learn more about Oswald. Toward the end it was cancentrated on damage control, to prevent (successfully) what would have been his most incredible concoction of a non-existing conspiracy with which he intended to commemorate the fifth assassination anniversary. He was going to charge a man he knew had killed himseld in New Orleans in 1962 with being a Grassy Knoll assassin in 1963! Among other things!

This, in more and sufficient detail is included in my February 8 letter to Stone. If you do not want to ask Stone for what I wrote him and what he did with it, if anything - as you'll see, this was quite some time before he started shooting -the friend I hope will be able to deliver this to you will have copies for you, if you want them.

I think you will see that although I did try to get his attention, I also offered to help him offering whatever documentation he wanted and to respond to questions.

Garrison's book is a big lie, a fraud and a travesty. (Harrs' is an incompetent and I think subsidized joke.)

Yet from it Stone also announced that he would be recording their history for the people, telling them who killed their President, why and how.

They, after some time I was given a copy of the script. It was not, as Stone alleges, stolen. When I read it I decided that Stone's fraud and travesty required exposure. This was not, as he alleged, a conspiracy between the CIA, its alleged kept reporters and The Establishment media. It was one enfeebled man of 78 who believed, from his previous experience, that an accurate story would mean a continuing story.

(My previous experience is that of a reporter, investigative reporter, Senate investigator and editor, and wartime -OSS - intelligence analyst.)

There was never a time when all government records were withheld. The Archives made those of the Commission's records it believed it could under the law available as rapidly as it could process them. I printed some in facsimile in early 1966.

After the Freedom of Information Act became law I started using it. It was amended in 1974 over one of my JFK assassination lawsuits, to open FBI, CIA and similar files. Before impaired health prevented my continuing these efforts I obtained and told Stone I had and he could use about a quarter of a million pages. He nonetheless continued to protest that they were all withheld until 2039.

If there is any basis for his use of this date it is in relation to the Commission's records which some of the nuts he refers to as "respected researchers" have been spouting. At least 200 cubic feet of those records have been available for several decades.

Literally, no records are suppressed. They could not be at least since 1974, when FOIA was amended over one of my lawsuits. The agencies, especially the FBI and the CIA, misuse FOIA's exemptions but many more than the 250,000 pages I have had for more than a decade are available and once processed are automatically available to anyone who requests them, inlcuding Oliver Stone, who did not. He did not have to- I make them available to all writers, unsupervised and with the use of our copier, as everyone working in the filed knows. But the exemptions themselves are oroper.

Do you think, for example, that the FBI or the CIA should disclose a report in which John Jones says that Kevin Costner and Oliver Stone are homosexuals? Or are deadbeats?

Those I have always regarded as "the House assassins" are not suppressing their records.

There is a law that requires Congressional committees' records not be made available for 50 years. The second of the pair of friends I refer to above, Mark Allen, and I both made FOIA requests for those rcords. Mine was more inclusive but health prevented my filing suit. The friend was had been my lawyer filed suit for Allen. The House itself sent its lawyer to invoke the law, the court sustained him, and the records of the House committee itself thus are not disclosed. But the records it got from federal agencies are disclosed.

It is one of Stone's many cock-and-bull stories, probably picked up from that strange assortment of "experts" most of whom are anything but that, he refers to as respected, which they are not except by fellow nuts.

Moreover, it amounts to fraud for him to give you or anyone else to believe that with the disclosure of the small fraction that remains withheld "we can learn what happened."

Here, as in many other areas, Stone could have improved his film vastly and made it honest rather than doshonest if he had used the records I got from the government. They leave it without question, from the highest levels to the FBI street agent, that it was never the intent to investigate the crime itself and it never was.

I believe but am not certain that a selection of these are among the records I have given Chip Sloby, who I'm going to ask to get this to you. He will, if you want them, give you copies. If he does not have them. I'll send some.

In short, Stone began with the intent to exploit and commercialize and in doing this he used many people of good reputation, including you. He took for this one project the name "Camelot." He titled the picture which is not about the President "JFK." He went through that well-publicized rigaramole of altering and repainting the TSBD and the theater not beccause that was necessary because it wasn't. It gave the world the impression that Stone would even fight and make enemies to be able to be completely faithful to fact.

He did, literally, trade on your name and that of others when he was criticized, like do you think Kevin Costner would have anything at all to do with a movie that was not honest? The same with some other names, and I have this, including as written by him.

There was a magnificent opportunity for a man of Stone's considerable talents if he had been honest, to begin with or when warned, if he had filmed the truth and not begun with and persisted on a disinformation, a Warren Report from the other side.

He and Garrison are alike in having trouble telling the truth by accident even.

Aside from what I told Stone about Garrison's book I annotated a copy of it for a college-professor friens, Dave Wrone, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point. I borrowed it back and have it. But Wrone can give you an authontic scholar's opinion on all of this. So also can Gerald McKnight, history professor at local Hood College, also a subject expert and the man who will be in charge when all my records, more than or close to 60 file cabinets, plus countless boxes, become a free public archive there, with no quid pro quo. (This is to say that all these records which are and have been available here for years will be available forever to any writer or any person of serious interest.)

If as I hope this reaches you and if you think any of your fellow-actors are interested please feel free to give them copies and to tell them that ~~as~~ to the degree I am able I'll respond to their questions as I will to yours, including with copies of goverments that are identifiable. I am not physically able to do the searching but I expect to have parttime student help for a while. Please excuse my typing. It cannot be any better.

I hope you are not damaged by this film. With all best wishes, Harold Weisberg

Afterthought: I should have made clear that Stone began his movie's promotions by telling the world that in it he would be recording their history for the people, telling them who killed their President, why and how. This is clearly not a description of fiction. It is non-fiction. In fiction he has a right to say anything he wants. But in non-fiction he does not have any right to rewrite our history and then demand that it not be subject to criticism until criticism is pointless, too late.

After my letter and after he knew George Gardner was working on a story Stone persisted in pretty much this same false description of his movie. As recently as a few days ago he was still referring to it as history and to himself as historian.

After he knew the truth he was still lying to defend his use of Garrison's fraudulent self-justification and his movie. One small detail is his insistent that Clay Shaw was identified officially as working for the CIA. The only official admission is that in common with millions of other Americans, he was in contact with the CIA's domestic-contact division. This is the norm universally and does not make a spook out of those who have normal intelligence information, particularly economic and business -related.